



## ATTACHMENT A

### Remarks

By this Amendment, independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2-7 have been amended for clarity and/or to better define the invention. It is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance for the following reasons.

In the *Claim Rejections* – 35 USC § 112 section of the outstanding Office Action, claim 9 was rejected under 35 USC § 112 for being indefinite. By this Amendment, the noted phrase has been changed to “to have free radiation contact”, to properly indicate that the detectors have a free area in which to sense. It will be noted that this is different from the interpretation which the examiner had made that there was a “reduction” provided.

In the *Claim Rejections* - 35 USC § 102 section, independent claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC § 102 as being anticipated by the Vitkala patent. However, for the following reasons, it is submitted that amended claim 1 is allowable over this reference.

As now more particularly claimed in amended independent claim 1, the present invention is used to observe specifically where in a furnace a glass sheet is, or a plurality of glass sheets are. This observation is made by measuring instruments (e.g., temperature detectors) using the effect whereby a measured lowered temperature is indicative of the presence of a glass sheet to be heated. Thus, in this manner, each glass sheet is determined to have a specific “location area” within the total area of the heating furnace. Then, by use of the control system, the heating effect of the elements at the observed location area or areas is increased.

The Vitkala patent discloses a method for heating glass sheets in which a temperature sensor is used to maintain the air heating temperature of the furnace substantially constant, but

with the speed of the heated air delivery fans increased to compensate for diminished differential heating as the glass is heated.

Thus, as evident from above, the Vitkala patent does not disclose or make obvious the use of temperature sensors to observe a glass sheet, and in particular to determine that the glass sheet (or sheets) is located in a specific “location area” (or areas). In addition, the Vitkala patent does not disclose or teach the use of the determined location area of a glass sheet to raise the heating effects of the heating elements for that observed location area.

Therefore, for all of the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that amended independent claim 1 is neither disclosed nor made obvious by the Vitkala patent. For these same reasons, it is submitted that dependent claims 2-9 are similarly allowable.

In the following *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103* section, dependent claims 5 and 9 were rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being obvious over the principal Vitkala patent. In making this rejection, the examiner indicated that the location of the sensors would be made “optimal” by those of ordinary skill in the art. However, such an optimization would have been made with regard to the sensing of the air temperature of the furnace to maintain it at a constant value as taught by the Vitkala patent. This is different from that of the present invention where the sensors are used to determine the location area of a glass sheet. Therefore, the location of the sensors as claimed in claims 5 and 9 is not made obvious by the differently located sensors of the Vitkala patent located for a different purpose.

Also in the *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103* section, dependent claims 2-4 and 6-8 were rejected. However, it is submitted that these claims are allowable at least for the same reason as independent claim 1 from which they depend as noted above.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and such action is solicited.